



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,349	07/17/2001	Mark Bagley	36-1462	2632
7590	11/08/2005		EXAMINER	
Nixon & Vanderhye 8th Floor 1100 North Glebe Road Arlington, VA 22201-4714			NGUYEN, CAM LINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/889,349	BAGLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CamLinh Nguyen	2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is response to the Amendment filed on 8/12/2005 and in light of the Interview on 10/26/2005. Consequently, claims 23 – 30 are newly added; claims 1 – 30 are currently pending for further processing.
2. Applicant's arguments regarding rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph about insufficient antecedent basis are acknowledged. Consequently, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph about insufficient antecedent basis is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 5, 13 - 16 recite the limitation "each template file being effective, when applied to a content file" in second limitation of these claims respectively. The Examiner is confused when Applicant refers to "each template file being effective, when applied to a content file". The Examiner is not sure if "a content file" is the same as "one or more content files" that was introduced before.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue et al (U.S. 5,987,480) in view of Christensen et al (U.S. 6,055,543).

◆ As per claim 1, 5, 9 – 10, 13 – 16, 23, 27,

Donohue et al (U.S. 5,987,480) discloses a method of managing information bearing content files stored in a computer file system, comprising:

- “The computer file system being divided into directories” col. 13 lines 22 – 26.
- “Locating one or more content files” corresponds to the command to locate documents (col. 7 lines 27 – 30).
- The “content files” corresponds to the “documents” that stored in the data source 12 in Fig. 1 (col. 7 lines 35 – 44).
- “Associating one or more template files with each directory in which at least one content file is stored” See col. 5 lines 25 – 31. The documents stored in the web server contain different formats; therefore, when applying to the template, it will carry out a respective predetermined operation on the documents (col. 1 lines 57 – 65).
- “Applying the or each template file associated with a given directory to each content file stored in that directory” col. 7 lines 15 – 22.
- “Wherein the respective directory in which each content file is stored determines which of the or each template file is applied” col. 5, lines 63 – 67, col. 10, lines 43 – 48.

Donohue teaches that the data source and the templates, which organized in a directory, are stored on the server computer, but does not clearly teach that the directory stores the content file and the template. In col. 4, lines 59 – 62, Donohue teach that the data source provided the content stored in the database represents or is reduced to name/value pairs. It is clear that the content file is inherent and stored in directory. Nonetheless, Christensen discloses a search system that the content file and the metadata are stored together in a content wrapper that is organized in a directory (col. 4, lines 55 – 56, 64 – 67, col. 5, lines 26 – 28, col. 6, lines 35 – 36). Both inventions are in the same filed (search and delivery document to user using metadata). Donohue and Christensen suggest that the invention may be modified to archive the scope of the claims (col. 14, lines 28 – 36, Donohue; col. 4, lines 41 – 47, Christensen).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the name-value in Donohue invention by the content file of Christensen because the combination would reduce the network traffic in searching for data. Only the metadata is accessed to perform the search (col. 5 lines 63 – col. 6 lines 5, Christensen), rather than the entire of document.

- ◆ As per claims 2, 6, 24, 28, the combination of Donohue and Christensen disclose:
 - “ The computer file system is divided into a hierarchical arrangement of directories” col. 5 lines 26 – 30, Donohue.

- ◆ As per claims 3, 7, 25, 29, the combination of Donohue and Christensen disclose:

Donohue teaches that the templates are stored in the directory. Each associate with a particular document or group of documents (col. 5 lines 26 – 30, Donohue.); therefore, the

association of a template with a directory is made on the basis of the template file being stored in that directory.

◆ As per claims 4, 8, 26, 30, the combination of Donohue and Christensen disclose:

- “ Associating metadata with each content file” See Fig. 3, col. 5 lines 8 – 10, Christensen.
- “ Carrying out the respective pre-determined operation on each content file... metadata” col. 1 lines 57 – 65, Donohue.

◆ As per claims 11 – 12, the combination of Donohue and Christensen disclose:

- “ The association of a template with a directory is made on the basis of the template file being stored in at least one of that directory and a parent directory of that directory” col. 10, lines 43 – 48, Donohue.

◆ As per claims 17 - 22, the combination of Donohue and Christensen disclose:

- “ Wherein the applying the or each template file associated with a given directory to each content file stored in that directory generates a corresponding template information-bearing file whose appearance is controlled by the or each associated template file” See the abstract of Donohue. The “corresponding template information-bearing file” corresponds to the “populated document” that is delivered to the user computer.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/12/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

◆ Applicant argues that the combination of Donohue and Christensen fails to teach “locating each content file being stored in a directory of the computer file system ... and applying the or each template file associated with a given directory to each content file stored in that

directory, wherein the respective directory in which each content file is stored determines which of the or each template file is applied". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The template is inherited in the directory of Donohue reference (col. 5, lines 24 – 26); therefore, one template can be applied to document in a lower lever of the directory. Referring to col. 5, lines 31 – 51, the directory is searched for a template, and the "respective directory in which each content file is stored determines which of the or each template file is applied".

♦ Applicant argues that the combination of Donohue and Christensen fails to teach a computer file system storing both one or more content files and one or more template files and being divided into directories". The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, Donohue discloses a template directory; each template is corresponding to one of a plurality of documents (see col. 5, lines 24 – 31). Christensen discloses a retrieval system that the content file and the metadata are stored together (see the abstract of Christensen).

As the result of the combination, the invention clearly includes a template directory (Donohue) that associated with a corresponding document (content file in Christensen).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2161

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 - 273 - 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 305-3900.

LN


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER